

CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS PUBLIC HEARING

DATE TAKEN: November 25, 2003
TIME: 6:30 p.m. - 8:50 p.m.
PLACE: 1300 Franklin Street, 6th Floor
Vancouver, Washington
COURT REPORTER: Cindy J. Holley, CSR

PROCEEDINGS

PRIDEMORE: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, I'll call this meeting of the Clark County Board of Commissioners for November 25th to order. Our purpose this evening is to receive testimony from the public on the proposed comprehensive plan and that we've been working on now for about four years. We've got a couple of things. Thus far it doesn't appear that we have so many people that we need to be real strict on time; however, I'd still like to ask that if you come forward to please keep your comments as brief as you can and specific to the point that you want the Board to be aware of. The Board does have in its possession the entire record from the Planning Commission hearings, so any information that you have submitted to that or any testimony which you gave to the Planning Commission is part of our record that we will be reading over the next three weeks as we move forward to some sort of conclusion on this process. We're also asking for this evening if you are here representing a City, if you're an employee of the City or if you are a professional representing organizations, or at any rate if it's possible for you to be here during a daytime hearing, we are asking that we try to focus those comments for there and try to allow citizens who have other jobs during the day and are not able to make it to a day hearing an opportunity for us to really focus on them this evening.

That said, even if you are in that circumstance but a daytime hearing is not feasible for you, then please feel free to come forward. If you have statements that are longer that would prevent you from being brief this evening, and our focus on being brief is really just to make sure we give everybody an opportunity to speak, but if you have longer comments or written comments that you wish to have entered into the record, please do so. This is a record that will be open for some time and will continue to receive written comments as well as additional verbal testimony, so keep that in mind as another alternative. Again, if you submitted information to the Planning Commission it is part of our record and we will be reviewing that as we move forward. Our hope this evening is to finish by 10:00. If we are close to finishing or if that's not feasible, we may go a little later. And the Board has also reserved additional time to continue the hearing to get additional comments from citizens. Before we begin, Commissioners Morris or Stanton, do you have anything you'd like to add or say?

STANTON: No, sir.

PRIDEMORE: Very well then, I'll turn it over to Mr. Lee for a brief introduction.

LEE: All right. As the Planning Commission was meeting until last night and passing out their recommendations to you I just wanted to briefly walk through those pieces of the packet that have come together in the last few days, make sure they have been inserted in your notebooks and then I will dispense with my comments and allow the public to speak. The first additions that have come out of the Planning Commission since last Thursday they did last night adopt their recommendations regarding the concept of urban holding and how it relates to urban growth boundaries, so that information is behind Tab Number 7. Last Thursday they also recommended a countywide planning policy regarding no net loss of industrial lands and a policy that would be binding on the unincorporated area only and that is behind Tab 8. There has been some updated appendices to the 6-year capital facilities plan and the entire capital facilities plan staff report with the updated appendices is behind Tab 9. And also you should have received now the recommended land use plans for Battle Ground and Vancouver and associated zoning.

So those are the pieces of information that sort of complete the packet that we gave to you in part last week. Prior to the meeting we did have an open house for people to view the maps. We did have copies of the 11-by-17 maps available to them that are in your packet, I think they were pretty hot sellers, and we also currently out on the table there are sort of the individual staff reports that go behind each of the tabs for people that want to pick up some of the written materials that explain the Planning Commission recommendation. And with that I will conclude my comments.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you. Any questions for Pat?

MORRIS: Yes. Did you just say, Mr. Lee, that we had something that had been left in front of us tonight? I think you used the word "on the table"?

LEE: Oh, for people that may be here to testify or hear the proceedings copies of the individual staff reports that were in your packet we had made copies and are out there so people can pick up a copy if it's an issue that they want to look at the narrative --

MORRIS: Okay, thank you.

LEE: -- that goes along with things.

MORRIS: I just hadn't noted that. And one other thing. In the past we have had periodically updated charts that showed each city with the population allocation, the density per units, the jobs to population ratio, the population per dwelling unit, dwelling units

per acre, will we have another one of those?

LEE: We can provide that information. We are working on some of that. We haven't got it completely together yet, but we can provide that.

MORRIS: Okay. Great. Thank you. That would be helpful.

PRIDEMORE: Commissioner Stanton?

STANTON: No, I'm fine. We need to go.

PRIDEMORE: We'll go ahead and open for testimony. If you haven't signed in we do encourage you to sign in in the back. We'll be going through the list hopefully in the order that folks signed in on. If you don't sign in, then at the end of the hearing we will open up for anybody else, but that could potentially be quite late so I'd encourage you to sign in first. Begin Mr. Printz. You haven't indicated whether you wanted to speak or not. Did you?

PRINTZ: I'm on the list.

PRIDEMORE: You're on the list but you didn't circle whether you wanted to testify.

PRINTZ: Randy Printz, 915 Broadway. I did want to testify; however, the way that staff had originally noticed this for tonight was for site-specific requests which is what I was going to address. I can certainly -- however, I am available to testify on the 8th in the, you know, during the day and so it's pretty much up to you guys. If you would rather have me testify then I'm happy to do that or I can do it now.

PRIDEMORE: How long were you planning to go?

PRINTZ: I did this before the PC which actually Vaughn was pretty happy about because I did about 10 or 11 pieces in about 20 minutes and I think I could do a lot less than that based on the changes that the Planning Commission made that at least I would view as being positive, so mostly what I really want to talk about is what the PC did last night and some of the urban holding versus interim UGA. But I can do that tonight or I can do it on the 8th, so whatever your pleasure is.

MORRIS: I'd prefer the 8th if you don't mind because we do have a lot of people here that are new faces that we haven't seen before and --

PRINTZ: That's fine.

MORRIS: -- we all tire out as the evening wears on. So if you wouldn't mind --

PRINTZ: No, that's absolutely fine.

MORRIS: -- then if you could come back.

PRINTZ: Thanks.

MORRIS: Great.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you. Pat Price. After Pat Price, Gretchen Starke. And, Gretchen, if you could maybe come up and take the second seat we're going to move through quicker.

STARKE: Aren't these microphones working? I could hardly hear you guys back there.

PRIDEMORE: Yeah, we need to get close enough to hear then. Ms. Price.

PRICE: Yes. Good evening, I'm Patricia Price, president of the Pleasant Highlands Neighborhood Association. As you are aware the Pleasant Highlands Neighborhood Association has been an active participant in the public input process as regards the comprehensive growth management plan and we recognize that for as much time and effort as we have put into both public testimony and written arguments, you and your staff have spent much more time and effort on this project in an attempt to ensure that the proper decision is made. You are to be commended for your diligence and your willingness to receive and consider the tremendous amount of public input which this issue has raised. The Pleasant Highlands Neighborhood Association thanks you for that.

We also wish to state that we support the Planning Commission's growth management recommendation and we encourage you to accept it.

We would also ask that you revisit the concept of the Discovery Corridor development along the I-5 as a means of providing a location for new commercial centers and industrial developments. This would go a long way to providing jobs for Clark County, utilizing existing major freeways and arterials while at the same time preventing negative impact to neighborhood livability. This would of course require some sort of acceptable of revenue sharing arrangement between the County and the Cities and we believe that you have the talents to make that happen. Let us all work towards a goal of more jobs for our citizens while creating and maintaining the quality of life which the residents of Clark County have come to expect. Thanks again to each of you for your hard work.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, Ms. Price. After Ms. Starke will be Leo Moon.

STARKE: My name is Gretchen Starke and I live at 308 NE 124th Avenue in Vancouver. I am the conservation chair of the Vancouver Audubon Society. The Vancouver Audubon Society promotes the conservation of birds and other wildlife, including fish. In order to have wildlife it is necessary that the animals have a place to live. For that reason we are concerned about the effects the

updated growth management plan would have on wildlife habitat.

I have some other things to talk about too. While the present proposal presently being considered is an improvement over the present situation there's still much that is objectionable. The biggest problem is the proposed rate of increase of population. The growth rate of 1.83 percent is much too fast and this is because of the miracle of compound interest. Because of geometric increase, a small increase in the rate of growth could lead to an actual very large increase in population. For instance, if at 1.83 percent increase in population were to increase indefinitely, the County population would double in 37.88 years, which is not quite the doubling time of Third World countries. And to give that in perspective, I have lived here 35 years and when an area grows that fast a lot of unpleasant things happen. For the 20-year period that is being analyzed the increase in population will be 44.2 percent. I assume the staff corrected it from the final because this projected population increase will put a great strain on public services and the natural resources of the County.

Now have you really considered what increasing the population more than 44 percent in the next 20 years would be like. Will the County be prepared. Will we be able to provide the needed services. Will we be able to protect our natural resources, our critical areas, everything that makes living in Clark County worthwhile. We, the Audubon Society, have our doubts. And frankly I don't think many people would support that kind of population increase if they fully understood it. More reasonable doubling time for population growth would be 50 years. Although any increase in population would have a serious effect on our community, a slower rate of growth would be easier to cope with. To achieve a 50 year doubling time the rate of growth would be 1.39 percent. This is not no growth, this is slower growth. If a growth rate of 1.39 percent is considered way too low for whatever reasons, your original choice of 1.5 percent would be the easier to handle than the 1.83 percent.

A growth rate of 1.5 percent would lead to a doubling time of 46.2 years. A decrease in growth rate from 1.83 percent to 1.5 percent, that is a decrease of only a third, causes an increase in the doubling time of 8 years and 4 months. Projecting a lower population growth would lead to policies that could actually decrease the runaway growth we have been experiencing. This would make -- in turn make it more likely we could accommodate growth without destroying that which makes Clark County a desirable place to live. We still think the urban growth boundaries are too large. They're better than the other alternatives explored, but they still should be brought in more. We're wary of allowing development of urban reserve areas. Such development would preclude future options. The conversion of large lot subdivisions to small lot subdivisions would make it difficult to plan a coherent street layout, the whole thing would result in very messy planning. It also forecloses planning for and saving open space. Providing for water and sewer efficiently would also be difficult.

Irregular street patterns and lack of open space are already problems in Clark County. And I'm not sure how many of you have had a problem finding somebody's place in the dark out there. Now I've stated before we have a problem specifics -- we have a problem with giving Fisher Swale to either Vancouver or Camas which is the only potential green area between the two cities. We have a problem with Battle Ground's overreaching and Ridgefield is a little bit greedy.

Concerning the effect of this plan on wildlife, increasing urban density while preserving more or less, more or less the rural areas of the county has both good and bad effects on wildlife. The good is that less land and less habitat will be affected by growth assuming that large lot subdivisions would not be allowed to sprawl all over the county. Large lot subdivisions also break up wildlife habitat. The bad is that all habitat within the urban growth boundaries could be trashed and will be trashed if there are insufficient mitigation measures; therefore mitigation of the adverse effects of the proposed alternative on wildlife becomes exceptionally important. Unfortunately as stated in the FEIS the mitigation measures for fish and wildlife habitat are inadequate. We will have to wait and hope for the update of the critical areas ordinances and the updated master shoreline management plan to get into place measures that could actually protect wildlife.

The specifics of the inadequacy of the local habitat protection measures are as follows: The number and type of identified priority habitats are too few. There's still no urban habitats identified. Meadows other than big game range seem to be lacking altogether. There's not -- does not seem to be much upland conifer forest identified. This is particularly true of the urban area. Further, the number of species to be concerned about is much too limited. The County should use several sources to determine species to protect because not everything at risk is officially listed, the Fish and Wildlife Service (inaudible) are a huge backlog. For birds alone there are six or seven reliable sources of information of species in trouble and I have included those sources in previous comments I sent in last summer. I can read them off to you if you like.

PRIDEMORE: Actually the brevity is really important.

STARKE: That's what I figured.

PRIDEMORE: We could be here --

STARKE: So --

PRIDEMORE: And if you could submit those comments in writing, we'll certainly have that.

STARKE: Yeah, it -- you'll find it somewhere if you read through the whole thing. The enforcement provisions and the local measures as stated in the FEIS are not mentioned and neither are the

exemptions. Enforcement and exemptions are critical to the effectiveness of mitigation measures. I got a really radical suggestion. Since it's going to be a year before the critical areas ordinances are doing, it will probably take the whole year to do it, perhaps there should be selected moratorium on particular kinds of development and in particular places. It could be discussed anyway. And in addition we, Vancouver Audubon Society, would like to be involved in the development of the updated wildlife ordinance. We have members that are knowledgeable about birds and other wildlife and we could provide good suggestions to the staff. Thank you very much. And I have --

PRIDEMORE: If you could give any written comments to the clerk, we will --

STARKE: Okay.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you. Leo Moon. After Mr. Moon will be John Karpinski.

MOON: Actually I would -- I'm Leo Moon, and I would like John Karpinski to speak for us.

KARPINSKI: Great. My name's John Karpinski. I'm here on behalf of Austin and Lee Moon, Terry Young and John Parker specifically to talk about the Meadow Glade area. I plan on giving other comments on behalf of CCNRC at the upcoming hearing so I'll just try to specifically focus on the Battle Ground area and some specific concerns. One of my clients' largest concerns is the adequacy of the STEP septic system in the Meadow Glade area. There hasn't really been a good capital facilities analysis of what the capacity is available, so you know me, I try to figure it out and it looks like there's about from my rough calculations approximately 102 EDUs left in the Meadow Glade area. So let me go through that. I'll just -- since I have written comments tonight I'll just provide you an overview of those comments and then I'll be available to any questions.

In regard to Meadow Glade, first of all you're supposed to be providing urban services in an urban area, a STEP system is sort of a hybrid between a septic and a sewer. Is it an urban level-of-service, is it a rural level-of-service, is it a suburban level-of-service, there's a question whether this is really an appropriate area. It looks like we're putting a lot of credence and a lot of growth in Battle Ground in this area based on the presence of this system. We're really not sure it's the kind of urban hub you want to be building around is our first point. The second point is that Hazel Dell Sewer District has put together a capital facilities plan of which this plan of course way outstrips in terms of capacity. Now I want to point out that the growth plan for the Hazel Dell Sewer District as to what they think growth could be doesn't line up at all with the amount of EDUs they have available. I just wanted to point that out.

Now to me the big point is how many EDUs available. My clients have contacted the Hazel Dell Sewer District and say, well, how many people are hooked up right now. According to them it's -- as of October it's 645.6 EDUs and the report from Wallace Engineering says that there is a total of 750 EDUs available for the Meadow Glade area. And even if you had that area built out at one-acre lots that would be 854 acres. So we don't have enough sewer capacity in Meadow Glade to serve the existing zoning out there much less the kind of industrial, or excuse me, the large urban expansion that we're talking about. I did talk to people at the Hazel Dell Sewer District today and I did say this is a 1998 report from Wallace Engineering, is there anything else that's newer on the capacity of this system and they told me no. So we have a problem in regard to adding this area to Battle Ground. These are on top of Battle Ground's problems, I'll quickly summarize them, there is the road capacity issue. Practically every road that would serve the Meadow Glade area would be failing according to the FEIS put out by the County. The school system there is already having problems, big problems, regarding financing.

I read, you know, I read all the capital facility stuff and your own capital facilities plan just for the existing growth in Battle Ground alone says there's \$90 million in unsecured funding, that's over half of the unsecured funding for the entire County's in the Battle Ground School District and we're proposing to add how many more schools there to a system that's already underfunded. The FEIS says that the Battle Ground water rights are likely insufficient in the near term to serve population growth and those are just the paper water rights, you know, much less the actual ability to go out and pump the water. So we think there's some real problems with this kind of expansion for Battle Ground, in particular Meadow Glade area.

I just wanted to state for the record that there are some of the countywide issues regarding capital facilities that we're stating for the record here, I'll discuss those in more detail at my other hearing so I won't bother to go into that today. And that's basically what I have to say. I'm trying to keep my comments as short as I can out of respect to all of the people here. I have a copy for everybody of my comments. And are there any questions?

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, Mr. Karpinski.

KARPINSKI: Okay, thank you very much.

PRIDEMORE: Terry Young and John Parker.

AUDIENCE: They were included in that.

PRIDEMORE: They were included in that.

AUDIENCE: (Inaudible).

PRIDEMORE: Thank you. Baz Stevens. After Mr. Stevens, Art Liss.

STEVENS: Baz Stevens, 26703 NE 77th Avenue, Battle Ground. I think the Planning Commission's recommendation regarding the Battle Ground's urban growth boundary expansion is pretty well right on the money, especially in terms of protecting the values of the East Fork of the Lewis River. Commissioner Morris, Commissioner Stanton and Commissioner Pridemore, I know that you very well have much, you know very well how much interest and energy there is throughout our county for caring for and enhancing the quality of the East Fork. From property owners, fisher people, recreationists, business folks and urban dwellers, Clark County's quality of life is surely enhanced by a healthy free-flowing river. As care-giver groups within the county we've invested tens of thousands of volunteer hours to work and to work to maintain and enrich the river system. And as our county leadership you know better than I the investments that we've placed in parks and greenways along the river.

During the comment period I'm sure that you will hear pleas from the City of Battle Ground to extend its boundaries to the north. Please note that during that City's public hearing on this matter only two citizens spoke in favor of a northern expansion. On the other hand over 30 county citizens involving -- including government officials from Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife, hydrologists, river conservationists, property owners and concerned individuals, spoke eloquently about the importance of keeping urban development well well away from the East Fork to prevent the myriad of negative impacts to the river associated with such developments, impacts from impervious surfaces, erosion, vehicle traffic, oil, lack of groundwater recharge, silting of spawning beds, endangered species issues, et cetera. So as it turns out, 239th Street is on the ridgeline and anything north of that drains directly into the East Fork. So the Planning Commission's recommendation for drawing the northern urban growth boundary expansion line at 239th is consistent with the viewpoint of those most knowledgeable about the East Fork and their beliefs of how best to protect it. So to earn a valuable return on our investment and to give us a chance to pass a true jewel on to our kids and our grandkids, let's be firm on drawing that line at 239th. Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, Mr. Stevens. Mr. Liss. And after Mr. Liss, Sam Kim.

LISS: Well, thank you. This is a little bit difficult to reach forward here. Thank you for making the time available, Commissioners. My testimony is in front of you so you can actually follow what I took the time to draft up. I'm actually here today representing my own neighborhood itself and so I wanted to sort of look at the definition of what Webster's defines as a "neighborhood" and they say it's a district or area with distinct characteristics, a neighborhood of fine homes, an ethnic neighborhood, you know, our particular subdivision is called Morning Meadows and it was basically a planned community of 25 homes on one-acre parcels at the time sort of away from the hustle

and bustle.

So what is Morning Meadows. Morning Meadows is a subdivision created around 1989 whose border is the extreme eastern end of the city of Vancouver and the extreme western end of the city of Camas separated by 192nd Avenue. Our northeast boundaries borders on wetlands. It's not uncommon on many an evening to hear and during the day to see cows, frogs, owls at night, deer, coyotes and raccoons to name a few trampling through our backyards. Part of our western boundary encompasses the closest semblance of an area park and a potential gravel mine, which of course is the Harmony Sports Complex, created through the combined efforts of Cascade Little League, Orchards Soccer Club and I must certainly give the County much credit for an opportunity to utilize the facility and the land there, and many of my kids and others in our neighborhood played there. At the time of purchase each and every homeowner who bought their acre were told their homes could not be placed right in the middle but had to be either in the front or the back half. Why, to make room for the possibility of a second home on the owner's other half. That was the essence of zoning back then which from what I understand, and I wrote this in I guess was called urban reserve 10, at least that was how I, what I gathered that's what the definition was.

Now we're looking at change as defined by this comprehensive plan and Webster defines "change" as to cause to be different. So we have the neighborhood with distinct characteristics and now there's a cause to be different. But wait, in addition to this comprehensive plan there are other significant events that have or are taking place that affect the quality of life at Morning Meadows. Section 30 is one square mile located in the unincorporated Clark County within the eastern Vancouver urban growth area conveniently bordering next to a portion of our subdivision. Section 30 is a development plan which will alter the quaintness of Morning Meadows forever. When development starts, traffic and congestion will impact this neighborhood for many years to come. Sadly, though, back then the only way in or out of Morning Meadows is off of 13th Street which is off of 192nd Avenue. This is a short distance now from the entry to Harmony and not far from where the projected second entrance will be.

Another less noticeable change was legislative redistricting that took place here as well as all over the country. Morning Meadows was in 17, now we're in District 18. Over a 10-year period the homeowner can get to know their local legislator. Whether they be a Republican or Democrat the district has basically had both representations there. Now we have to contend with three legislators unfamiliar to many in our neighborhood. Legislative redistricting is never a positive for people, only politicians. Unfortunately most of the homeowners don't realize their representation changed and probably don't care. School boundaries, been there, done that. Harmony Elementary, Heritage High, Pacific Junior High School, have all been built since Morning Meadows was started and as parents we went through the process and we're still

seeing it today. Property values, I don't know what the effect would be if our particular subdivision is categorized as R1-6, what this would have on the existing properties.

But now we come to the issue of zoning and again defined as legislative regulations by which a municipal government seeks to control the use of buildings and land within the municipality. Though zoning has its place, it seems to evolve and change and never stays the same. A person's home is a major purchase. Zoning rules in effect at the moment of purchase tend to dictate a homeowner's choice. There was reliance on those urban 10 rules. This plan will change the rules of prior purchase by reclassifying our neighborhood as R1-6, which means that the remaining half acre three homes could be built on that unless testimony such as mine reclassifies once more that Morning Meadows dignity will be preserved as it was designed, built and proposed to each and every one of us, urban reserve 10, not R1-6. To date I am not aware of any homeowner who has built a second home on the other half acre.

Lastly is the crux of the problem. Why would one, why would any of our existing homeowners avail themselves of this proposed change if it goes through. It certainly would not be for the esthetic value.

No. It would solely be for a factor of money and perceived opportunity. Who benefits, the uncaring neighbor who sells their half acre for greed, the ambitious builder who buys and builds for profits and a County whose property tax basis increases each time a new home is built. Then there's the new homeowner who bought in never knowing what the real value there used to be before the purchase. I pose the question to you, the Commissioners and the staff, with the task of making all these pieces fit, how does this establish quaint neighborhood benefit. It doesn't. One-acre lots are not a commonplace and attempting to subdivide the other half is madness. I propose with the pending construction inconveniences surrounding Section 30 this neighborhood will have enough of people to contend with. I respectfully recommend that we continue with the urban reserve 10 for now. By the next time the -- by the time the next review takes place Section 30 will be complete and a reassessment could be made once again at that future date. Adding R1-6 along with Section 30 construction is not neighborhood friendly. And I thank you for the opportunity for my testimony.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you for providing it in writing.

MORRIS: Mr. Liss, are you currently inside urban growth boundaries or outside urban growth boundaries?

LISS: That's a good question because I think we're in the unincorporated area of Clark County. We're sort of like in that section where Camas and Vancouver meets.

MORRIS: I know. But you still could be outside of either Vancouver or Camas and inside the Vancouver or the Camas urban growth boundary. And, Mr. Dust, I've been looking on these maps and I'm not exactly sure where he is.

DUST: We can point that out for you in a few moments, Commissioner.

LISS: Right. It's the swale, the Cascade Swale. Or what do they call it?

DUST: You're actually --

MORRIS: It's south of that.

PRIDEMORE: We probably don't need to --

MORRIS: You don't need to lower that.

PRIDEMORE: This whole thing.

DUST: Right there?

LISS: That's correct.

MORRIS: So you are outside urban growth --

DUST: That's the existing boundary on 192nd.

LISS: Right.

MORRIS: Okay, you're outside. Okay.

LISS: We're outside.

MORRIS: Is your subdivision built out?

LISS: Yes, it's all built. It's been that way probably from 1989 to about 1992, '93.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, Mr. Liss. Thank you.

LISS: That's it? Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: Doug, you are definitely not Sam Kim.

KIM: Commissioner Pridemore, I'd like to yield the floor to Doug Ballou, chair of the Neighborhood Association of Clark -- Council of Clark County.

BALLOU: Thank you, Sam.

PRIDEMORE: I'm sorry, Doug, just to -- after Mr. Ballou will be George Vartanian. You can go ahead, I'm sorry.

BALLOU: Okay. Doug Ballou, 3109 NE 96th Street. I'm speaking on behalf of the Neighborhood Associations Council of Clark County, I'm the chair of that organization. Our group has been actively

involved for a number of --

AUDIENCE: Could you speak louder, please.

BALLOU: Our group has been actively involved for a number of years in the comp plan process and we've submitted comments on a number of occasions. I would point tonight to our Planning Commission comments of September 25th, you should have it in your packet, and I won't cover in any detail tonight, just in brevity. But I would like to say that the neighborhood associations in the county are pretty -- there's pretty significant implications for them on any changes to the proposed comp plan and I'm pleased to say that over the last couple of years many of our neighborhoods have become very active and recognize the need to be involved in this process. You heard just earlier tonight Pat Price from Pleasant Highlands who spoke and they've been working very closely with our County planning staff and I'm pleased to say it's been a very positive outcome and some of the comments that you see in our letter from several months ago, some of those issues have been addressed, not necessarily all of them, but I think it's been a real positive thing for the communities, the neighborhoods.

One of our biggest issues has been transitional development; in other words we don't want very diverse uses next to each other, we want existing neighborhoods to be a transition between the existing neighborhood and industrial or commercial development and a logical transition. And there's been some very good subarea planning going on, it hasn't been going on countywide but in certain specific neighborhoods that has resulted in some changes in the proposed zoning from what was originally looked at and I view that as a positive thing for everyone involved and I wish there was more of that that had been happening. But the problem is you need active participation by the citizens and where you get it, then you get better planning in the areas. So one of the things our organization recommended is that we do more subarea planning so and that's what we stick with.

Also one of our recommendations was to create architectural and design standards. It's something our organization has been promoting for a number of years. It's something that we've heard from other citizens, a desire to have those standards and many communities across the nation who are growing as fast or had developed as much as we have in a community have those types of standards. And I don't think we're proposing anything complicated, I think having an understanding of what is required in terms of those standards and having a community where -- or a committee formed that could review those. In fact I was at a developer meeting last night, a development that's going to impact my neighborhood, and the first question out of a fellow resident was what kind of homes are you going to build there, what, you know, what's the style going to be, that's a big concern of citizens and so that's one that we're going to continue to promote and I'd like to see it and our organization members would like to see it in the comp plan and it be a product of this is an ordinance regarding

architectural design standards for commercial, residential and industrial. And the committee that would be formed would obviously represent across the community, representatives from across the community, not just the development community but also interested citizens who would want to participate in that.

So again I appreciate, our organization appreciates, the opportunity to participate and comment in this process and your decisions in the next few weeks, few months, are going to have significant ramifications on our community. I was involved in the '94 plan and believe me at the time I didn't realize how huge those policy decisions would shape and affect our community and now I really see that and have helped others within our neighborhood associations in the county see that too. So thank you very much.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, Mr. Kim.

BALLOU: Appreciate it.

MORRIS: Mr. Ballou, you referenced comments that you made to the Planning Commission. Was that September 25th?

BALLOU: Yes.

MORRIS: Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: Thanks.

SACULLES: Hello.

PRIDEMORE: You're definitely not George Vartanian.

SACULLES: Hello everyone. At this point in time I decided to think about it some more and not give my testimony. Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: Not give testimony? Okay. And your name was?

SACULLES: Enya.

PRIDEMORE: Okay. Oh, here you are. Okay, thank you.

SACULLES: Yes, thank you.

PRIDEMORE: Mr. Vartanian. After Mr. Vartanian we'll have Ole Brahe-Pedersen. Am I close. Go ahead, sir.

VARTANIAN: Good evening. My name is George Vartanian. I'm at 2217 NE 179th Street, Ridgefield, Unit 5. I'm here on behalf of not only myself but the Fairgrounds Neighborhood Association. I'm a Board member of their organization. First, thank you very much for the opportunity for testimony. And I'd like to comment on your staff, the planning staff, they're quite a dedicated group who puts up with an awful lot of stuff from the neighborhoods and still keeps their smiling faces and does in fact submit information when

it's requested and happily so, so nice job.

MORRIS: Smile, Mr. Lee.

PRIDEMORE: Yeah, smile when he says that.

MORRIS: Smile, Mr. Lee.

VARTANIAN: Yeah, Pat big smile. It's Higbie that smiled.

MORRIS: Mr. Higbie, are you smiling?

VARTANIAN: A couple of things. You've already seen our testimony or will see it in the form of writing, but I just want to hit some highlights that are already on the record. We would considerably like to see some -- we would like to see some more quality of life issues and neighborhood compatibility issues specifically mentioned in the comp plan, most specifically transition of development from most intense to least intense development and along with Mr. Ballou something to do with architectural standards and maybe even a committee with buy-off by neighborhoods or at least input from the neighborhoods more than what is currently available.

On the issues of zoning I'm aware that mixed use and light industrial and perhaps some of the other employment areas are still in the process of being developed the definition of zonings and wondered if we could get those finalized before adoption -- approval and adoption of the comp plan so we all know what we're approving or not approving of. Specifically in the mixed use zone I would like to see a limit placed on commercial footprints to 50,000-square feet. I believe anything bigger than that belongs either in community commercial, which is a C-3 zone, or highway commercial which I think is CH or HC. 50,000-square feet, bigger than 50,000-square feet gets to be quite a big store, if you will.

There is currently a mixed use area being proposed on the north side of 179th which is in the newly -- to be newly expanded area of the urban growth area, that is going to be about a third of a mile from the community commercial area at the bottom of the hill at 179th and Union so that if you're going to put bigger stores in the proposed mixed use, it's going to be not too far from the next place you could put a big store like that.

Furthermore, there's a new -- apparently a new community commercial zone being proposed at 179th and 29th, the northwest corner according to the map I've just seen tonight, and that again is going to, it's all coming clear now, and that is probably two-thirds of a mile from the community commercial at 179th and Union. I'm not sure you want community commercial to be that close together. Perhaps changing that proposed community commercial zone to neighborhood commercial which would be very well accepted I'm sure throughout, but we haven't talked about that because this was a map change just made.

As far as last night's Planning Commission proposal of utilizing

interim boundaries, I'm very uncomfortable with using interim boundaries until the capital facilities plan decides where you can afford to put the boundaries. I, you know, we would much rather see the boundaries if they have to be expanded to the proposed areas that are currently proposed and all that go into urban holding pending subarea planning and making sure that all the facilities that are supposed to be servicing urban areas are in fact available. And one of the concerns that we discussed considerably last night was how does one get a piece of property out of urban holding to be developed if it's got all of the facilities, and as I think staff mentioned last night or counsel, you don't have to wait for the whole area to come out of urban holding, I would certainly think you could get parcels out piecemeal as long as their facilities are available. That's all I have. If you have any questions?

MORRIS: Yes. You said there was new zoning for community commercial at the northeast corner of 179th and what?

VARTANIAN: 179th and 29th Avenue.

MORRIS: Thanks.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, Mr. Vartanian.

VARTANIAN: Okay. Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: And I apologize for the name Mr. Brahe --

BRAHE-PEDERSEN: That's fine.

PRIDEMORE: -- Pedersen.

BRAHE-PEDERSEN: That's fine. It's a rather unusual name.

PRIDEMORE: After --

BRAHE-PEDERSEN: My name is Ole Brahe-Pedersen.

PRIDEMORE: After this gentleman --

MORRIS: After Ole, we get that part.

PRIDEMORE: -- then Tom Massie will be up. Sorry, sir.

BRAHE-PEDERSEN: My address is 32106 NW La Center Road. I live at the junction of Timmen Road. Now I'm here tonight on behalf of myself and my neighbors to commend the Planning Commission and staff for not including, repeating, for not including the Timmen Road expansion request from La Center. Now it has been repeatedly voiced and printed that La Center wishes incrementally to expand to the I-5 Junction, that's at Exit 16, this of course would affect the entire neighborhood, it would be unreasonable, it is totally illogical from an environmental point of view, from a topographical

point of view and a distance point of view. Such expansion would not be contiguous to the city because of the wetlands and I urge the Board of Commissioners to follow through in its following proceedings to support the rejection of this expansion proposal. That is all. Thank you very much.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, sir. We'll have Mr. Massie and then Mark Feichtinger. Sir.

MASSIE: My name is Tom Massie. I live at in Battle Ground. I have a piece of property on Hazel Dell Avenue at 7104 NE Hazel Dell Avenue. It's bordered on one side and across the street from commercial property. I believe that its best use is commercial property, it's now zoned multi-family and I'm asking you to consider a commercial zone for it. I've turned in some documentation on it as far as the zoning map and so forth. I'm not -- I don't have those supporting documents here.

PRIDEMORE: If you've got them for the record then --

MASSIE: Yeah.

PRIDEMORE: -- they'll be there.

MASSIE: That's all I have.

PRIDEMORE: Okay.

MORRIS: You submitted your documentation to staff or the Planning Commission?

MASSIE: Pardon me?

MORRIS: You submitted your documentation to staff or to the Planning -- to staff prior to Planning Commission? Or when did you submit it?

PRIDEMORE: It was prior, he's actually on the list.

MORRIS: I know he's on the list, but I'm trying to get a timing. If I were to go back and look at your documentation, when would it have been stamped and --

LEE: I don't have all the index of Planning Commission comments in front of me so I'd have to refer back to that letter. I don't know if you have the index there or not. But I'm presuming it was the letter submitted to the Planning Commission by either yourself or Mr. Crego you indicated?

MASSIE: Right.

MORRIS: Was that it?

MASSIE: Yeah.

MORRIS: That's all I wanted. Thanks.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, sir. Mr. Feichtinger, I saw him earlier. Okay, well, we'll move on for now and to Vern Veysey. After Mr. Veysey we'll have Jim Kodama, 612 East McLoughlin Boulevard.

VEYSEY: Commissioners, my name is Vern Veysey. I live at 4816 NE 259th in Ridgefield, here on behalf of a couple of property owners. Their issues were discussed by the Planning Commission and I agree mostly with their findings, but I'd like to make a couple of comments in reference to the comments made to you by Vaughn Lein in your November 25th memo. If you look at the second page where it talks about urban holding policy language, and this deals with a 40-acre piece of property that's adjacent to WSU just off of 50th Avenue, the property is, and you'll see in your reports from my testimony before the Planning Commission, is mostly except for about 16 acres environmentally sensitive with a creek running through the middle, it actually divides the property into two parcels. One that's adjacent to the urban area and one that's next to 50th and would very well be associated with the college. And my request at that time was to do some kind of a mixed use so they could be considered separately.

In your proposal, which I agree with, the idea would be to complete a master plan which would include all that property and ensure that appropriate public services are there. Of course the question becomes when will the plan be done and at the time the plan is done would that take into account the diversity of the property so it could have a different use than what is currently being zoned, because if you keep the zoning as it is, it is not practical to put the commercial type or the office buildings next to the residential area which would be at the far west end of the property. So I just want to make the comment here so staff can send that planning process where maybe the zoning can change and be redone at that time during the planning process. But I'm glad that they're changing the criteria here and I appreciate that and I hope you accept those recommendations.

The second one I want to comment on is regarding Ridgefield. And Mr. Swindell owns a piece of property on the southeast corner of 264th and 10th Avenue. He currently has a commercial structure on it with several different activities in that structure. When you look at the Ridgefield urban growth area, which is on your -- Page 4 of your memo, it implies that annexation can occur if there's a full range of services there. This is an issue for him because currently he has -- the property is served by septic system, it's served by public water, it was a site plan that was agreed to and approved by the County. It seems to me that that should not have the same criteria as the larger expanses of space that you're looking at which would obviously have to have an extension of sewer and whatever. So I would ask that that be considered as an exception here so that Mr. Swindell's property could be annexed and not have to have sewer right at the door. It will eventually get

there, but it would be nice for him to be able to move ahead and do this without looking at this criteria.

MORRIS: Mr. Veysey, I'm having trouble hearing you. I'm concentrating and I still can't.

VEYSEY: You are. Let me speak up then. If you look at his property he presently has -- it's served by septic, it has public water and what's implied at this particular section here is that unless sewer is available he cannot be annexed and I don't think that's reasonable. His property was approved by the County, had site plan approval, all the asphalt, drainage and everything else has been done, that is the one thing that's not there and it would be a shame to hold him up from annexation simply because sewer was not there at the door. So I'd ask you to give some consideration to that for a policy change. That's it.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, Commissioner. I apologize, sir, I just couldn't read the last name.

KODAMA: Not a problem. Kodama.

PRIDEMORE: Once more.

KODAMA: Kodama.

PRIDEMORE: Okay.

KODAMA: K-o-d-a-m-a.

PRIDEMORE: And Jim Wilson will be --

KODAMA: Yes, my name is James Kodama, 612 East McLoughlin, Vancouver, Washington. I am a staff member for the Pacific Northwest Regional Council of Carpenters. We cover five states and I represent the members out of 1715 which is 7 to 800 membership located throughout all of Clark County. We understand the hard job ahead of you and as County Commissioners I want to, you know, acknowledge the fact that your vision and what you've laid out is great. The only thing I haven't seen is an economic development committee established to address some of the needs of growth for the different cities. And there's been several testimonies here on that growth and I think that that needs to be developed and recommendations for accepting of this comprehensive plan I don't see as a problem with the recommendation that an economic development committee be established to assure the residents of Clark County that the utilities and the structures needed to support the growth would be able to be funded by the residents through the tax base.

And I don't look at it, you know, I am organized labor but, and there is unorganized labor, there is Republicans and there is Democrats, but one thing whether you're a business owner or you're a worker, you're still a laborer, you still labor for what you have

and you have to meet all the needs and we have to meet the needs of the county and the taxation either business-wise or local individuals to meet the needs of the growth. Growth is going to happen. I mean population growth is going to occur, but without a proper economic development committee to look at this, to address these issues, to assure that our tax dollars are utilized to the maximum ability that they can be and also that living wages to maintain a certain life-style in Clark County are met, I don't think that, you know, you're going to have a lot of unrest from the residents and a lot of questions, but I applaud you for opening up those discussions. I'm just hoping that the foresight to develop that committee and the opportunity to invite labor to sit on that in one form or another, you know, we welcome, we welcome those challenges. I'm a tradesman, I've never stopped building a building when I've ran into problems, we figured out how to, how to build the building. So we look forward to helping you build your vision and we ask that you ask us on that and we ask that you develop that committee to set, to look at those issues.

PRIDEMORE: Sir, are you referring to the REET infrastructure committee process or are you -- is there a different --

KODAMA: No, I'm not familiar with that at all. I did ask some questions if there was an economic development committee established for this proposal to look at the rezoning and for the growth pattern and what we're looking at, I was told that that was being thought about so I thought it was pertinent to bring that issue aboard to look at and I feel that it needs to be addressed one way or another.

PRIDEMORE: Okay. We did in this process early on task the Columbia River Economic Development Council which is the County's economic development representative to craft a strategic plan for us which is included in the policy recommendations in coming forward with this comprehensive plan, it sounds like you're referring a lot to the capital facilities necessary and that's certainly something we need to, will be continuing to work on.

KODAMA: All right. And I hope you invite labor to sit on that.

PRIDEMORE: Absolutely.

KODAMA: Thank you, sir.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, sir. Jim Wilson. After Mr. Wilson we'll have Nada Lingel.

WILSON: Speak into the microphone. Okay. My name is Jim Wilson, James A. Wilson, I reside at 27811 NE 14th Court in Ridgefield, Washington. I've spoken to you folks before. I was a little surprised tonight to see the large chunk, the generous chunk of Ridgefield proposed business park expansion. Our houses reside in the Helen's View Phase I and Phase II area and you are now right across the road from where we live. And obviously we have the same

kind of neighborhood oriented concern, property value, maintenance, that many other neighborhoods in Clark County are going to have, especially when they're faced with being either surrounded by or immediately adjacent to an industrial or business park development.

I'm an architect by training so I know it is possible, as one testified earlier, to have controls in place, to have design review committees, to have input from developers and professionals to create buffer zones, to create park areas, to minimize the visual impact that these buildings and vehicles can obviously have. The fact is that we can see Dollar Tree from where we live and so we already have an example of a monstrous development that doesn't appear to have very many visual barriers between the surrounding property owners and that particular development, whereas across from I-5 immediately adjacent to the highway there are some very sensitive developments with a low scaled building development and berming and green areas that seem very effective in preserving some of those property values. As we are part of that dinosaur of one-acre lots we recognize that there will be development around us, but we're particularly interested in how that development shapes. I know that the people in Clayborn Acres there are only nine units in there, and the people in the Boschma Estates I think there are only three developed acreage sites in that little development, but they are completely surrounded by this business park zone.

And we, most of us, some of us, saw the presentation that architect Larry Wilson made this last summer showing how some of those impacts could be mitigated by park land and water drainage areas and we know that that's possible. But go on the record saying you're getting close and we really -- most of us were really hoping that there could be residential buffer zones particularly along 10th where the east side of 10th is dominated by houses, particularly in the area that's been expanded in the urban -- in the 20-year comprehensive plan urban growth area.

PRIDEMORE: Sir, have you seen, had an opportunity to see the standards that are being proposed for the business park zone?

WILSON: I can honestly say I have not. And I probably should have looked at the map prior to tonight, but I just made it myself available in the corridor out here.

PRIDEMORE: It's actually in a policy area and so it's probably not as easy to find as on a map.

WILSON: Is it on the Web site?

PRIDEMORE: It should be. Mr. Lee, is the business park zoning standards --

LEE: We can certainly get you a copy of them tonight. We have them. I don't know if they're on the Web site or not. I think there are, but there were some revisions the Planning Commission

made so it might not be the latest version up yet.

PRIDEMORE: I think it is an important one to make sure we make available because that is a concern that we are hearing about and hopefully the revised standards will mitigate a lot of that. But it would be great if we could get that to you and you could provide comments if you feel it's inadequate.

LOWRY: Although inasmuch as he's located in Ridgefield it's anticipated that annexation would precede development so it's really the Ridgefield ordinances that will control.

PRIDEMORE: That's a good point. So we'll need to continue to work with Ridgefield as well.

WILSON: We will.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, Mr. Wilson.

WILSON: Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: Hello.

LINGEL: Hello.

PRIDEMORE: Ms. Lingel?

LINGEL: Yes.

PRIDEMORE: And then Rosalind Wang after Ms. Lingel.

LINGEL: Thank you. My name is Nada Lingel. I represent the Lingel Trust which owns property which is currently according to the new Planning Commission recommendation just north and just west of the boundaries placed for the urban growth boundary on the area of SR-502 and 92nd. We have the biggest block of land which is kind of, kind of cut around there on the map, and also the block of land which is at the corner of 92nd and SR-502. I do have them marked with a green X on my map, I can certainly leave that if this would help.

We are going to request a very different thing than I've heard mostly tonight. The owners of these two pieces of property would prefer to be in the urban growth boundary and I just wanted to let you know that. So once again, exactly northwest of the current boundaries is a big 60-acre plot, and then just at the corner of 92nd and at SR-502. Thank you.

MORRIS: That's which urban growth boundary?

LINGEL: I'm sorry?

MORRIS: Which urban growth boundary?

LINGEL: I'm sorry, Battle Ground.

MORRIS: Thank you.

LINGEL: Sorry. Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you very much. We have --

WANG: I'm David Wang, I'm speaking for my wife Rosalind.

PRIDEMORE: Yes, sir. And Geoff Little will be next.

WANG: And she put me up here. I just want to be simple and quick. This is first visit to the Planning Commission tonight and we see the boundary change since the last about a month ago and this property include in the southeast corner of 98th -- 94th and 199th near the Battle Ground urban growth boundary. I think the last plan is much better because it has a mixed area which include the industrial, light industrial and commercial. I think if you just put a whole bunch of R1-5 or R1-6 in there, then a whole bunch of building and there's no mixed development will be really hurting the area. Then that will really need some more (inaudible) too to be because that will be need people to go outside that area to work and that create more jobs in Portland probably. So I think the previous planning or plan was much better. And this is our first quick impression so we put our name in there just trying to voice our opinion.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, sir.

WANG: Thank you very much.

PRIDEMORE: We'll have Mr. Little and then Doug Ballou, you are signed up again. It looks like he's left, I'll assume he got his comments, and then Loren Carlson after Mr. Little. Sir.

LITTLE: Thank you. My name is Geoff Little. I live at 5304 NE 326th Avenue in Camas and we are in a development called Rushing River Estates, it's about 10 miles northeast of Lacamas Lake. When my family and I first bought our parcel out there it was zoned R-5 in 1993. I believe in 1994 the Planning Commission reevaluated the long-range plan and switched that zoning to FR-40. When they did this I believe what they did was use the Little Washougal River as a natural boundary and basically what it did was take a third of our development and thrust it into FR-40 and the other two-thirds remained R-5 and what this has done is severely limited those parcels, the usage of those parcels that have been redesignated FR-40 and my concern is was it simply a mapping error or was this an intentional thing and what I would like is perhaps for you to review it and respond to me by mail and let me know what you determine, what the Commission determines. I also understand that currently under this portion of the review that we are not looking at ag or rural properties and I would be curious as to when that might be reviewed.

PRIDEMORE: There's a couple. If I could ask first, how many acres do you have there?

LITTLE: My parcel's 5, we have 5-acre parcels, 10-acre parcels in that whole development, and basically everything on the southeast side of the Little Washougal River is noncompliant now.

PRIDEMORE: Well, we'll definitely have staff look into that and get back to you as you requested and get a letter to you. This normally would -- this is the process when you would potentially make changes in rural land designations. The Board at the -- several years ago made a commitment that during this comprehensive plan update should any policy changes in the comprehensive plan suggest that changes needed to be made in existing rural zoning that we would include those during this comprehensive plan update.

As it has worked out there are not policy changes that have made changes in the -- suggested changes in the rural zoning so it's not being considered under this. It could certainly come up again during a future comprehensive plan update process or, second, it is possible for you to put in for an annual review request to specifically look at that.

Also, if staff reviews your specific process and finds out that it was indeed a mapping error, that's something that we can take care of through the Board's docket process. If it's not considered to be an error but a legitimate zoning issue, you could put in for that annual review. Of course that's \$5,000 and so it could get a little difficult, but it's something we could look into.

LITTLE: Right. The property behind us is State forest land and I understand the reason for putting it in there, it was completely logged off during I believe '02, '03, and, you know, our area will definitely never be considered forest property proper. So if you could review that I'd certainly appreciate it.

PRIDEMORE: That's something we'll ask staff to review.

MORRIS: Mr. Little, are you close to either Camas or Washougal UGB?

LITTLE: Pardon?

MORRIS: Are you close to either the Camas or the Washougal urban growth boundaries?

LITTLE: We are probably right on the edge. When we first moved there we were actually on the Washougal School District and we petitioned to be changed over into the Camas School District so I think we're right on the edge there.

MORRIS: Now did you harvest the timber?

LITTLE: Pardon?

MORRIS: Did you harvest the timber?

LITTLE: No. No. It's State forest land that borders our eastern property line.

MORRIS: And do you grow timber?

LITTLE: Do I, no.

MORRIS: Is your property timbered?

LITTLE: It had been logged off prior to us purchasing it.

MORRIS: And it wasn't replanted?

LITTLE: It was replanted and there is Fir and Alder but it is all very young.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, sir. Hopefully we'll be able to get back to you real quick on that information. We have Mr. Carlson and then David Shroyer.

CARLSON: Hello. My name is Loren Carlson and I own the Orchards Feed Mill at 6017 NE 109th Avenue and the surrounding property is 6101. I'm here looking for a rezone for the property that surrounds the store. We've gone through most of the process so far. From what I understand for property to be rezoned it needs to make sense to both the County as well as be in the best interest of the community. I'd like to briefly address these two issues.

The property is conducive to a commercial node based on blocks rather than the undesirable strip development that's taken place in Orchards so far. Secondly, the feed mill is one of the oldest existing businesses in Clark County dating back to the late 1800s. For this business to remain viable and part of our history we need room to expand the business. The only way that this can happen is for the rezone of the surrounding property. So maintaining a part of Clark County history if it's important to the community, then I feel that that addresses the best interest in the community. I just wanted to bring that up today. Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: You're on the list for consideration. The Planning Commission has recommended that your property be considered on the Board's docket and they recommended that we initiate that process right after the first of the year. So depending on how the will of the Board, that may very well be taken into account then.

CARLSON: Okay. So will we be made aware of what's going on after the first of the year then?

PRIDEMORE: Yes, sir.

CARLSON: Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you. We have David Shroyer and following him will be Alison and Richard Strobel. Sorry, sir.

SHROYER: I'm David Shroyer. I live at 17712 NW 41st Avenue out in -- a ways away from the urban growth boundary or the urban reserve even, so this is more of a technical issue I have in terms of where lines are drawn and I'm looking mostly at the area around 179th/199th where you're expanding close to the freeway up north. The boundaries are, these don't affect me directly, but the boundaries in these areas seem to be drawn pretty much exclusively on major arterials or major roads, that doesn't seem like the best use of the infrastructure dollars in terms of getting to an area. You take an intersection and say, okay, the infrastructure is coming up one of these major roads, let's pick that intersection and make that industrial or mixed use or residential, R-6 or R or whatever something, rather than taking a whole block and everything across the street even though there's sewer down that road, there's power down there, there's water, there's the road infrastructure is being built out, but you can't do anything across the street, but it's costing taxpayers money to put the services there for half the people and the other half can't use it but we're all paying for it.

So I'd like to see the older developed older lines have much more jags around trying to go up corridors on both sides and things like that, I'd like to see that kind of proposal where you can keep development in this area, then you work out to the next, the next area and put part of it in the urban reserve out there, then the next area is going to be in the urban reserve rather than this one block that's in and the next big block is out. I think that's about it.

PRIDEMORE: That's a very good point. Thank you. We have Ms. Strobel and then Richard Dyrland.

STROBEL: Alison Strobel, 5305 NE 132nd Way, Vancouver, Washington. My husband and I live in the Pleasant Valley area on 5 acres bordering NE 50th Avenue and the south edge of the Philbrooks' property which extends north to NE 139th Street. The comprehensive growth management plan currently proposes that the Philbrooks' property, our property and that of our immediate neighbors be zoned low density residential. We would like to thank Pat Lee and the Planning Commission for considering our testimony and that of Pleasant Highlands Neighborhood Association and our immediate neighbors. I feel I can say with confidence that we are pleased with the recommendation of low density residential zoning for this area.

As we testified earlier before the Planning Commission, we want to see Clark County grow into a thriving, environmentally healthy and attractive community, a place where we can work and play. This can be accomplished by placing jobs along major transportation corridors and providing a variety of neighborhoods to satisfy the needs of a diverse population. Thank you for the opportunity to

express our opinions concerning the plans for development in the Pleasant Valley area and we urge you to approve low density residential zoning for this area as recommended by the Planning Commission.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, Ms. Strobel. I did see Mr. Dyrland earlier but I don't see him now.

ROSE: He had to leave and I'd like to speak in his place.

PRIDEMORE: Please do.

ROSE: My name is Scott Rose and I live at 27313 NE Bennett Road in Battle Ground, Washington. I'd like to say thank you, Commissioners, for your hard work on this difficult project. As I said I'm speaking for Richard Dyrland, he had to leave, but not before submitting a 20-page document spelling out his concerns regarding the Battle Ground area's growth. For the record I concur with his comments and ask that you make decisions regarding placement of urban growth boundaries with environmental issues in mind, particularly when wetlands, agricultural soils, groundwater, surface water and the East Fork Lewis River come into play. The Battle Ground area seems to be expanding at too rapid a rate and I'm concerned about the area's roads, schools and wildlife. Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: If it's only 20 pages that will be the shortest thing I've seen from Dick. Larry Wilson. After Mr. Wilson we'll have Scott Rose. Oh, Scott Rose. No, you can go ahead and leave. Larry Wilson. Is that him in the back or probably not. Randy Brown. Charles Parsons. It looks like Paul and Randy Haa. Thom McConathy.

MORRIS: He just walked -- oh, there he is.

PRIDEMORE: There he is.

MCCONATHY: Good evening. I'm Thom McConathy of 1017 NE 107th Street, Vancouver, Washington 98685. This plan sustains and accommodates the growth of very large urban growth boundaries and this is a bad thing and it is the absolute antithesis for which growth management was originally developed. These large UGAs are leading to a situation where chaos reigns, the people that live within these very large UGAs live, and pardon my expression, hell because we do not receive the benefits, the mitigating effects of parks and other infrastructure of which is designed to make living in an urban situation possible or desirable, this is completely opposite, the urban framework process, the visual framework process that this process in Clark County was built upon. We had a vision at one time of what this was to be and it was a vision of a place that was desirable to live and in Clark County. It was going to be a place where we had commercial mixed with residential, both built in such a way as to respect the incredible richness of our natural environment here in Clark County and this plan is going to make

instead a meaner, nastier Clark County.

We are making a situation where I today incrementally do not live at the quality or standards of life that I did when I graduated high school environmentally in Clark County. My children conversely will live at a much more degraded level and I feel very badly about that and I see that this plan sustains that. I see that many systems, the septic system problems that were identified back in the '60s in the Mundorf groundwater study in Clark County of saying that these systems were never intended as long-term solutions to sanitation, that we are increasingly depended upon them, and I see that the groundwater is steadily going downhill in its quality. It isn't for the urban wells, that's all that is being protected, but nonurban wells of which 30,000 households outside of the urban growth boundaries and another 40,000 that are within the urban growth boundaries are still on private wells, none of these in this proposal receive any protection and in fact are assured that their groundwater will deteriorate further. There is no assurances of groundwater protection for anything but municipal wells in this and this is wrong.

We should be protecting our surface waters better. This plan has no assurance or plans or planned concurrency. When are we going to have a single watershed plan. There are no watershed plans in Clark County. We were, you know, it was only a few years ago that we were going to systematically plan throughout, there is no plans in place today. I think that this plan is a step backward. I mean just a few years ago, when we did this four years ago, we had -- we were told that there was going to be a systematic effort to do that planning and it has never taken place. Not a single plan anywhere in Clark County. There is no septic tank conversion program. There should be. If we have these huge urban growth boundaries, we should have some way where we're going to systematically convert these to sewer services. To write it off until the Cities do it without assurances that the Cities will even systematically take in all of their huge UGAs is, this is chaos. The people that are forced to live in these places it is worse than chaos, this isn't right.

I really am disappointed at the parks and open spaces in this received that are such important mitigating programs to urbanization that they are not going to be meeting higher standards. They are effectively frozen in this plan. This is not good. The open space program is being terribly neglected. If you look at the open space lands in Clark County, they are being worse than neglected, they are being vandalized and the County is not behaving as a responsible steward of this important resource. Instead of seeing this used to help mitigate some of the effects of urbanization, it's primarily being used as, you know, to do corridors for -- that are very important for parks. This is a very important program that should be and was envisioned when it was originally developed that it was going to be a lot more than just the parks program, that it was going to help us in our watershed protection and I see very little of it being utilized with this

idea in mind.

And I see also that the County still is not getting -- standing up to its responsibilities of sewerage and is depending upon to a sewerage service of the Hazel Dell Sewer District and upon the urban services offered by the various Cities and this isn't right.

If you're going to be allowing these huge UGAs, then you also have a responsibility to offering sewerage services. It isn't right to the people that have to live downstream from, it isn't right to the people of which have to drink the effluent from that. You know, if you go back to the 1990 groundwater plan, in it in the appendices of which supported it the USGS which showed certain areas in Clark County at very elevated levels of nitrates and it was so high that it is astonishing that people would drink that, but they're drinking it, it's just not right, and you're by allowing greater urbanization of these areas these people, because it's like the frog in the boiling water, because it's boiling slowly they don't realize they're being boiled to death, and that's what is happening to people is that they're being boiled to death. I have other testimony of which I gave you via the planning process before the Planning Commission. This is my most important things though.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, sir. We're going to take a brief break. I don't want to be indelicate, but we would appreciate it if you'll allow the Board a chance to get to certain facilities located outside this room so we can get back in probably six or seven minutes, something as quickly as we can, and we'll continue with the testimony at that time. Thank you.

(Pause in proceedings.)

PRIDEMORE: Good evening. We'll go ahead and reconvene now for additional testimony on the comprehensive plan. Begin the second half with Tony Plescia. Mr. Plescia will be followed by Cathy Steiger. Good evening, sir.

PLESCIA: Evening. The letter and some exhibits. My name is Tony Plescia. My office is at 1310 Main Street, Vancouver, Washington. I'm representing myself and owners of a 30-acre parcel located at the intersection of 92nd Avenue and 179th Street, northeast Clark County southwest of Battle Ground across the street and adjacent to the rural center of Meadow Glade. In an effort to be brief and not take up more than a few minutes of this hearing, I have entered into the files for the Commissioners and the staff a request, our request and exhibits related to our property continue to be considered and included in the upcoming expansion of Clark County.

Our parcels were included in the initial proposed comp plan by the County Long-Range Planning staff in September of this year, to be changed from agricultural to urban low residential developable property. At that time we immediately responded to Clark County staff instead of coming and testifying and taking up time with a letter to go on record of our approval of the proposed County zone change. On November 21st and following up, you know, where the

activity was going with the Planning Commission, I went down to the offices of the County and we were informed upon inquiry of the staff, you know, what was the status of our property and they indicated that the Planning Commissioners were not going to be recommending this property as initially thought. We were quite surprised by this because we were lasted for quite a long time it appeared. We are now requesting the Commissioners to reevaluate our property and its specific benefits that make it a prime candidate to be considered and included in the upcoming urban expansion of Clark County.

MORRIS: Mr. Plescia --

PLESCIA: Yes.

MORRIS: -- excuse me for interrupting you. The list that we have been provided give us -- they are arranged according to the names of the property owner who made the site-specific request. Could you tell us that name?

PLESCIA: The property owner by record is 92nd Avenue, LLC, and the property, that's our property which is 21 acres, a 5 acre and a 16-acre parcel. In addition to our parcel being recommended, early on there were two 5-acre pieces that adjoin us that Mark Holbrook who is here tonight owns and Mark Holbrook I'm representing also with his permission Mark Holbrook.

MORRIS: So these were not site-specific requests then, Mr. Lee, or do you recall, they were simply included in the map that you had --

LEE: I believe Mr. Plescia had submitted a request in the proposed plan that the Board referred to complete the EIS in July and the capital facilities analysis, it was included in the Battle Ground urban growth boundary and it was one of the -- or the properties he is talking about were some among the properties that are not included in the Planning Commission's recommendation.

MORRIS: So they were not? At some point in time they dropped off our site-specific list?

PRIDEMORE: They weren't on the site-specific.

LEE: No. No. They didn't drop off the site-specific.

MORRIS: I thought he just said they were a site-specific request originally?

PRIDEMORE: Well, Mr. Plescia actually had come to the Board a couple years ago now regarding that, the sewer connection issue, and was referred to this process. And his property was included on the original map for Battle Ground and that's one that -- and it is that western piece that kind of broke out a little bit, so it wasn't technically handled as a site-specific but --

PLESCIA: Commissioners, do you want me to proceed now?

MORRIS: Yeah. Oh, yes, I'm sorry, thank you.

PRIDEMORE: Yes.

PLESCIA: In summarize, it will add jobs and more importantly capital expense funds are going to be provided by this project. It is on a corridor with all of the utilities, 92nd Avenue has all the utilities, sewer, water, all the utilities, you know, to support the development of this property. And more specifically the sewer line is there, okay, it does exist, it can be used by both sides of the street. Our project and that sewer facility I heard earlier Mr. Karpinski, you know, coming up with some facts and so forth, that line has been paid for and any benefit, any fees that are not paid for connection by a new project or home or whatever go directly into the coffers of Hazel Dell Sewer District to, you know, for other facilities throughout the county. This project alone we've estimated will probably provide over a 1 million 100 thousand dollars that the sewer district can use towards other, you know, regional facilities and improvements. And finally the project will fulfill a demand for medium priced housing in that area. With that I thank you for your hard work, the opportunity to testify tonight, and, you know, with the hopes that these hearings go easy for you folks, you're going to have a tough time. Anyway, if there's any questions or whatever that I can answer, please ask them now.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, sir.

PLESCIA: Okay.

PRIDEMORE: We'll have Cathy Steiger and then John Bishop. Ms. Steiger. Mr. Bishop.

BISHOP: What was that name, sir?

PRIDEMORE: I think it's John Bishop. JB Bishop. Oh, it's not John Bishop, okay. I actually know a John Bishop and I thought it was him but --

BISHOP: County Commissioners, my name is JB Bishop. My address is 12609 SE 125th here in Vancouver, Washington 98683. I testified on behalf of this issue which is site-specific to the Planning Commission in October and I submitted prior to that a letter outlining on October 16th for that hearing prior to my testimony after that the issue at hand. Explicitly what I'm here for this evening is to continue to raise the issue which is site-specific on the Vancouver Fisher Swale map. It is the property down at the southern corner of the map of the quarry property that is zoned currently heavy manufacturing and is being recommended to be retained as heavy manufacturing while the County Commission is being asked to uphold the Planning Commission's directions and the County planning staff's directions of taking the rest of the

property there that's the wide area in blue and looking to that as a future long-range plan of business park. The comments that I'm making are on behalf of the adjacent property owner directly to the west of the heavy industrial site zone. And again that is a -- and we recognize that that is the current zoning of the property, heavy manufacturing, and at this stage and a recent change by the County planning staff there is now recommendation that this be retained as heavy manufacturing instead of what staff had initiated in its review and brought to the Planning Commission that this property in addition to the rest of the blue all be business park. There's been a recent change at the planning staff's level and a direction just recently, in the last few days, to the County planning staff to the County Planning Commission that this property stay as heavy manufacturing.

I'm speaking on behalf of the property owners directly to the west. Mrs. Nancy Dewbar, her father is permanently ill with Alzheimer's, lives on the property directly adjacent to the west of the mill there. It shows as a tax lot to the west of the heavy manufacturing zone. The next property owner is Mr. Robert Jones who's a business associate of mine and I am speaking on his behalf. He's permanently handicapped and not able to attend meetings such as these. And then the next two property owners who I am speaking with and in concert with is Dr. and Mrs. Brookings who have recently given their eight acres directly to the west there, that large parcel on the map, to the Columbia Land Trust and it's in a nature conservation trust. And then the last person, who obviously can speak for himself, the last property owner there that's shown in that yellow is Mr. Paul King who is a noted naturalist and industrialist here in Clark County. This is his personal residence on the Columbia River and he's in the affected area of this comprehensive plan recommendation.

Briefly and to the point, on behalf of those property owners we raised the issue in July when we found out that inadvertently a map error had been made in this planning process that those residential properties, the four that I just named the owners, had been inadvertently colored as business park. And the same error happened in 1994 when the plan map was done and the first time we corrected that through the action of this Board in 1996 through this same process and got it corrected. We were surprised to see that it came back a second time. Those things happen, we understand that, and we were aware of it and so we participated in the process and we're pleased to say that the staff clearly acknowledged that they had made a map error and so we were this time able to correct it before you as County Commissioners put it into place a second time and we'd have to come back two years later and correct it. So we're pleased to be able not to have to do this in arrears.

But what we are concerned about, and I will be taking -- the Brookings and Paul King are not available this evening or else they would have been here. And Mrs. Dewbar is not able to get here because of her daily responsibilities with her father who has

Alzheimer's, we are going to be talking to the City of Vancouver who initiated a letter to Clark County recommending that they supported the business park planning for all the property except for the long-range change from heavy industrial where the mill is now and that the City of Vancouver recommended that this stay as heavy industrial. We intend to talk to the planning staff with the City of Vancouver and then get back to your planning staff and we would make our major testimony in the Brookings and Mrs. Waterman will be here at your December 8th hearing.

The only last comment I need to make, we need to do some homework because there's been a last minute change from the staff and the County Commission Planning Commission to what was a sense of direction for the last five months on this property which was to incorporate what is currently heavy industrial to put it into business park. As adjacent property owners that has a substantial impact in the long-term, but before we register serious concerns or make a recommendation, as citizen owners of property adjacent to this we need to do some homework and so I'll reserve any comments until then.

The only other bit of comment that I need to make as a wrap-up is that the adjacent property lessee Columbia Vista Corp which operates the historical mill that has been historically on the site for many decades, they're the current operators of that and they lease that property from Peter Kiewit who owns half of the quarry and owns this property along the river, they've been a very good neighbor and the property owners wanted me to make that in the public record that they've been an excellent neighbor and they've been cooperative and recently discussing with us why they feel they would be endangered and their 82 jobs would be endangered if this was changed to what the County staff and the Planning Commission is looking at to business park. They're concerned about their future viability if they were to be construed in the future as a nonconforming use. That makes sense to us and we need to do some homework so we'll be back in front of you and not wanting to take much of your time at your next hearing.

PRIDEMORE: Good.

BISHOP: Thank you for your consideration.

MORRIS: Mr. Bishop --

BISHOP: Yes, ma'am.

MORRIS: -- I'm confused now.

BISHOP: All right.

MORRIS: Do you want it to be business park or do you want it to be heavy industrial or do you want it to be residential?

BISHOP: The property that is owned by the Watermans, by Robert

Jones, by the Brookings and by Paul King, that property is now designated as residential on the plan and we would like you to uphold that as a Planning Commission recommendation. The property that you as adjacent and nearby property owners to the area to the north which is the light blue which is colored on this map as business park, we totally support that as going into business park which would be I think an excellent economic development and job producer in this area when the infrastructure and the development and the property owners work together. We support that totally. In regards to the deep purple the existing -- which is existing zoning heavy manufacturing I cannot answer that question on how we support or do not support that. Until we talk to the City of Vancouver and we talk to your staff a little more, I can't answer that at this stage, Mrs. Morris.

MORRIS: But in general, except for that you're pleased with the Planning Commission recommendation?

BISHOP: Absolutely. Absolutely.

MORRIS: Okay, thank you.

BISHOP: Thank you kindly.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you. It sounds like there's gremlins out there who are determined to get this rezoned. Take care of that. Mike Wynne. Brad Andersen. Mike Wynne. Mr. Andersen.

ANDERSEN: Good evening. I'm Brad Andersen of the law firm of Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, and to my left is Randy Favor who is the Chief Financial Officer for my client Poulsbo RV. We were recommended to go through this process to maybe correct what we perceived to be a mistake from 1994. Poulsbo, and maybe I'll go ahead and hand these up to you, but Poulsbo owns an RV store right out by the fairgrounds, the opposite side of the fairgrounds on 197th. They've that, that's been an RV store since the early '80s. It employees 50 people and it's been in business for a long time. And when they came to us this summer on a land use issue, we started looking at the history of this and we found out that before 1994 it was zoned highway commercial, it was changed in 1994 and I can't figure out why it was changed in 1994, so we're here before you asking you to change that. The address of the property is 17611 NE Union Road. I don't know, it's -- a lot of people know it because it's so close to the freeway but if I say Jollie's, they know exactly where I'm talking about. So it's right, it's right along the strip there. Poulsbo has been there a long time.

What we're asking you to do is to correct what we think was an incorrect rezone or a zoning of it in or a designation of it in 1994 and I would start and I won't repeat everything in the letter because that would take too long, but if you look at the Clark County code and the definition of "highway commercial" it talks about things as large space users, outdoor sales, wholesale activity, but more importantly it talks about its proximity to a

major interchange or next to the freeway. I don't think you could come up with a business that's much closer to the freeway than Poulsbo's, Jollie's and there's a rock, a landscape rock business that's nearby. I know that you're looking forward, but I think it's also important to remember or to preserve those businesses that do exist.

Now our client does have a nonconforming use on these four parcels, but that makes it very difficult because whenever you're trying to do something to expand or even to get insurance or to continue or to get a loan, it makes it a less stable position whenever you're arguing a nonconforming use. So we're here asking you to preserve a good employer and also a very good location for commercial highway. So other than that I'd just answer any questions you might have.

PRIDEMORE: Questions?

ANDERSEN: Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, sir. James Fenn. After Mr. Fenn we'll have Joe Leak, Joe Lear.

FENN: I'm James Fenn. I reside at 5511 NE 75 Street. The property in question is 13506 NE 72nd Avenue. I'm here for site-specific. I hope that stops, boink, there it is.

PRIDEMORE: I'm really starting to hate that thing.

MORRIS: And what's the name under, the site-specific, is it Fenn?

FENN: It is Fenn.

MORRIS: Thank you.

FENN: F-e-n-n. I bought the property in 1997. It was being used commercially for some 30 years prior to that. I basically testified on the 23rd of October to County planning folks and I'm sure you remember this picture on the wall on the board, but we're already commercial and we'd kind of like to stay there. I'd like to see a community commercial going on there, highway frontage on 72nd with the mega traffic count corner type of lot. The church is across the street on the other corner, they already use our parking lot. And everything's going on. So we do have one single-family home on there, that's the only thing that's residential, it is being used by a contractor that happens to live there and works at the shop. Most homes that we see that are zoned commercial, you know, home properties or whatever on say Mill Plain area, the corridors, they end up having attorney firms or, you know, whatnot, inside those that are rehabed and offices go in those and so we would like to maintain that same presence there and not change anything at all and go ahead and get the zoning that would basically qualify what's going on on that property so.

MORRIS: What was the years that I believe the recommendation was for you to change to R1-7.5?

FENN: Yes, that is correct, that's what I understand is it will be going to R1-7.5. As you can see there's lots of dirt around there to build houses on. The property just to our south is owned by an older lady and she's been offered money, there's spec buying going on on that street already, property developers, house builders and all that's going on and she doesn't want to sell. You know, old people what are they going to do with a bunch of bucks. You know, they like the houses, you know, and the 18 acres or whatever she has, that kind of thing. I'm fairly well built out as well. This is my retirement thing and I'm not all that old yet so, but so that's kind of the thing with urban growth things, when you open up dirt to build on, people don't want to sell, then what. I don't think anybody's ever addressed that at any of the meetings I've been to, but, you know, that's what happens in this area. There's a lot of folks who have been there for 40, 50, 60 years and now their kids are buying on the street when something comes up for sale. You don't see realtor signs on the street very often, on the side roads or anything, all the family knows each other and they, their kids buy up, that's happened multi times on 137th which we border so.

MORRIS: But you want to be neighborhood commercial?

FENN: We are looking for CC, community commercial. So I don't want highway frontage, I think that's what C-3, that allows a Costco, we already have one of those, and the property's not big enough to do all that. The County planners in the meeting I testified a few weeks back said, hey, what if we diced this thing up and give you part commercial, part residential, great idea; however, when you have a really tiny piece of commercial property nobody can do anything with it anyway so it's better to keep it all one according to the people I've talked to. I did check around with the neighbors, did the door knocking thing one Saturday afternoon, and just wanted to get a kind of an idea of opinion and on the road and said, hey, you know, do you realize this property does not have the zoning yet on commercial, they all thought it did. And I asked if they had any objections to keeping up with what we've got going in our community commercial zoning, I had none at all, more or less it was keep up the good work, thanks for keeping the place clean so. There's a drive-by when you get a chance but you pretty much have an idea, a single-family is just the dark roof on the -- what would be the southeast corner of the property, you see a big bunch of green on the southeast corner, 72nd Avenue runs north/south, and the gray up in the corner is parking lot and it's all commercial buildings so. Okay. Any questions?

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, sir.

FENN: Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: So Joe Lear. And George Schumaker will follow Mr.

Lear. Good evening, sir.

LEAR: Good evening. My name is Joe Lear. I live at 17640 NE 120th Avenue, Battle Ground. I thank you for allowing me to speak before this Board. I am here to request the property known as Windsong Acres be immediately placed within the current and permanent urban growth boundary, that it be zoned at a minimum low density residential. I also request that the six acres directly east of NE 120th Avenue be zoned highway commercial. I did have a site-specific request on this three years ago and up to a couple of meetings ago it was on the map as a site-specific. The property directly across the highway from this six acres has already been commercial for three years. I have spoken about this property before but have limited my comments until now, I feel that I must correct some previous comments.

Windsong Acres start out as 2.5-acre lots, a total of 30 acres. I did sell some one-acre lots along NE 120th Avenue and as I told each purchaser, including Mr. and Mrs. Moon, that I was applying for a private road and gated community permit, they could be part of it if they wished. The Moons said that they wanted to be part of the gated community, their grandchildren would be better protected within a gated community. The Moons attended the Clark County Commissioners' hearing when the private road, gated community was approved. I spoke before the Commissioners at that time and stated the reason I wanted the gated community was to better to protect the children. The Moons did not object to the approval; however, when it came time for all property owners fronting NE 120th Avenue and NE 177th Circle to sign the road maintenance agreement the Moons refused, they wanted the privacy and security of a gated community but did not want to pay their fair share. Without their signature the gated community could not become a reality. I have enclosed three different CC&Rs Section 10 that shows 2001, 2002 to be the same. The 2003 version was done because the Moons stated they wanted a gated community. This version only applied to the gated community. When the Moons destroyed this plan they also placed signs in their yard and scared off potential buyers of the two and a half acre lots. I had a large development loan that was due, I had no choice but to sell to a home developer.

I previously submitted a site-specific request for the six acres on the east side of NE 120th Avenue to be zoned commercial. This is all documented in the long-range planning records. This was also told to all the lot buyers, including the Moons. I specifically told them that I would like to see a medical/dental complex and a veterinary clinic, this would compliment the housing development. A letter to this effect had been presented to long-range planning.

All infrastructure and utilities are in this road, including sewer, natural gas, power, phone, cable, everything, so there's nothing to be put in, I paid for it all. Mr. Murry Bergeron, the property owner to the south also wants to be zoned highway commercial. With NE 120th Avenue running south and then tying right back into SR-503, that was the original plan when the State

Highway Department put in NE 120th Avenue. My dream of gated community has been destroyed so I had to go and sell the property to go and pay off some of the big loans I had, but I would like to make the six acres as commercial, that would create jobs. We need more jobs in the county to go along with more residential. We can't have all residential and then have everyone have to work in Portland.

PRIDEMORE: As I understand it, Patrick, if I'm wrong correct me, right now the portions that he has requested for commercial you are recommending R1-5?

LEE: That is correct.

LEAR: That property is situated just before a light at 179th Street and when the tractor-trailers put on their brakes, you might as well think they're coming through your living room door.

PRIDEMORE: And you approve of the R1-5 on the 28 acres; is that right?

LEAR: Yes.

PRIDEMORE: Okay. Thank you, sir.

LEAR: Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: Mr. Schumaker.

SCHUMAKER: Schumaker, yes, or Schumaker. The old generation was Schumaker and the new generation is Schumaker. Anyway, my name is George Schumaker, address 27, mailing address 2719 NE 93rd Avenue. It's site-specific request tonight. My particular parcel is just north of the city limits of the old town city limits of Ridgefield, it's next to the current Heron Ridge Development project, it's approximately 45 acres, and I'm kind of here -- I'm between a rock and hard place because I don't want to anger the City Fathers of Ridgefield by doing something they don't intend me to do, but I can see they're building out toward the I-5 freeway. And that's probably a good strategy, but it's kind of leaving behind what I thought would be the Growth Management Act's desire was to build up in a traditional manner around the small cities.

The particular parcel I'm recommending is currently in current use but I'm having a lot of difficulty farming this parcel because of high predator pressure from the Ridgefield Refuge, and I'm also having vandalism and trespassing, I'd like to move my farming operation further out and put this parcel up for its best use. And I think the best use is probably the highest density it will occupy or be useful for. It's got fairly good access. There's a couple of questions on that access being perfect, but I think that can be resolved. It's within walking distance to the grade school. It has close accessibility to City sewer and City water and therefore I am kind of suggesting to bring things back home and developing

more in a traditional manner around these small cities and I'm giving my 45 acres up for that circumstance. My letter is submitted with the -- or it was submitted with the Clark County Planning Commission so if you want to review that. If you have any questions, I'll answer those.

PRIDEMORE: I'm sure we will. Thank you very much. That actually concludes what I have written down for people who wanted to testify. We'll open it up now if there is anyone else who would like to comment to the Board. Mr. Kepcha.

KEPCHA: My name is Michael Kepcha and I live out Washougal, 39215 NE 28th Street. And I sent you a bunch of written stuff when you had open for written and so I'm not even going to go there. I just would hope that next time when you do this five-year review coming up after this one gets completely done that you leave some provision in there for the people to have the yearly process instead of like this time, I don't know if that was moratorium or what, so you don't get behind like you did this time. And if there's some way that you could possibly legally put one panel for the comprehensive review separate from the regular Planning Commission, that would be very helpful for the community if you could do that. That's the only thing I had to say. Thank you.

PRIDEMORE: I appreciate your comments. I know the Board regrets the fact that we've held off on a lot of these as long as it's ended up being. Thank you. Anyone else wishing to testify to the Board this evening? Anyone else wish to testify this evening? Okay. According to our scheduling plans we are to continue this hearing until the evening of December 9th.

MORRIS: Don't we have hearings on December the 8th?

PRIDEMORE: Yes, actually I suppose that's the best way. The idea was that December 9th we would continue for the -- for citizens who work and focus the December 8th daytime for those institutions and --

STANTON: So did we advertise them separately? Is that what you're saying?

PRIDEMORE: How did we do that? It was just -- well, we've explained to people but --

MORRIS: Maybe we could just continue this hearing until the 8th with also public notice that we will be holding testimony, having testimony on the 9th.

PRIDEMORE: Yeah, that's the intention.

STANTON: There may be some people who the one on the 8th is open to anyone who wants to come and testify, we're just saying those who are here to represent somebody and are getting paid anyway come out, but there may be some people who want to come and --

PRIDEMORE: The afternoon on the 8th, sure.

STANTON: I'd prefer to just continue.

PRIDEMORE: Yeah, I guess you're right procedural.

MORRIS: Mr. Chairman, I move that we continue this public hearing on the comprehensive plan until December the 8th at 1:30 p.m. in this room.

STANTON: Second.

PRIDEMORE: It's moved and seconded to continue this hearing to December 8th at 1:30. All those in favor.

MORRIS: Mr. Lowry's trying to talk.

PRIDEMORE: Oh, I'm sorry.

LOWRY: In the event that the 9th wasn't advertised you may want to specifically indicate a day, time and place that you will be meeting on the 9th.

PRIDEMORE: My understanding is that we have --

MORRIS: Here.

PRIDEMORE: -- advertised that.

LEE: Yes, we have sent out press releases indicating there would be testimony on the 8th sort of focusing on the institutional testimony and continue the more individual testimony on December 9. Whether that was also in a formal legal notice or if the intent was to simply continue as the motion that Commissioner Morris has made I would have to check on the notice specifically.

PRIDEMORE: I think the intention of the Board is that we would continue to the 9th.

LOWRY: Right. And my only concern would be that you --

PRIDEMORE: Just more focus on the (inaudible).

LOWRY: -- also indicate a specific time and place on the 9th.

PRIDEMORE: Well, we've --

MORRIS: In this room.

PRIDEMORE: -- what we've suggested is 6:30 here and we've actually reserved the 9th day for --

STANTON: In case we have to continue the one from the 8th.

PRIDEMORE: Right. But so -- well, that's just to be continuous. I mean I think right now the Board's intention would be that we will have Monday afternoon the 8th, 1:30 to 5:00 focusing or at least being most available to the institutional folks, and then presumably continuing on to December 9th evening 6:30 here at the Public Service Center and we will then continue from there for deliberations, right now we've reserved the entire day of December 16th.

MORRIS: We also have the morning of the 9th if we feel like we need to have more internal conversation or meet with staff.

PRIDEMORE: Sure. Okay. So the motion is to continue this hearing to December 8th at 1:30. All in favor.

MORRIS: AYE

STANTON: AYE

PRIDEMORE: AYE

PRIDEMORE: Opposed. Motion passes. And just a side comment to close, I think this is extremely helpful testimony this evening and a lot of information that we can certainly weigh as we move forward in deliberations and would congratulate and thank everybody for their testimony this evening. There being no further business before us this evening and without objection, we stand adjourned.

(At 8:50 p.m. hearing adjourned.)

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Betty Sue Morris/s/
Betty Sue Morris, Chair

Judie Stanton/s/
Judie Stanton, Commissioner

Craig A. Pridemore, Commissioner

ATTEST:

Louise Richards/s/
Clerk of the Board